DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 306 CE 081 180

AUTHOR Miles, Curtis
TITLE Help Needed: How Can High-Risk Adults Prepare for Skilled Jobs in South Carolina?
SPONS AGENCY South Carolina Partnership for Distance Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE 2000-10-00
NOTE 51p.
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://www.sc-partnership.org/Final%20Reports/Piedmont.htm.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; At Risk Persons; *Educational Needs; Employment Problems; *Job Layoff; *Job Training; Labor Force Nonparticipants; Low Income Groups; Lower Class; Postsecondary Education; Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; Statewide Planning; Underemployment; *Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina; Workforce Investment Act 1998

ABSTRACT

A study examined the job-training needs of high-risk adults to determine who they are, what they need in order to obtain productive careers paying a living wage, what is available, what works and doesn't, and what South Carolina should do to assist this population. Data were obtained from several dozen focus groups across the state, discussion with state government leaders and national experts, and review of national studies. The study identified these three groups of people who need assistance, which together make up more than 30 percent of the potential work force in the state: the chronically unemployed, recently laid-off workers, and the working poor. The groups have somewhat different, but overlapping, needs and prospects. They are served by social service agencies, education agencies, private non-profit agencies, and for-profit companies. The major funding sources for work force development are welfare reform and the Workforce Investment Act. Lack of reliable child care and transportation remain chronic barriers for many. Features common to successful programs include the following: (1) collaboration (among providers, early provider involvement, ongoing communication); (2) program design (customized to employer needs, early agreements, clear goals, minimal hassle, avoidance of labeling, continual staff development); (3) program services (both work and learning, hands-on experience, personal attention, strong support services, job coaches/developers, credibility); (4) training delivery (job-specific skills, content blended with relationship-building, integrated skills, intense training, active learning, high expectations, motivation, work experience); and (5) program accountability (tracking and documentation, accountability of clients, staff, employers, and funders). Although distance learning has been suggested as beneficial for these groups, little has been done in that direction. The study recommended creation of a task force to explore what works and doesn't and to prepare a detailed plan for a "work and learn together" system for the state. (Appendices contain project profiles and 27 references.) (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

CE

ED 449 306

How Can High-Risk Adults Prepare for Skilled Jobs in South Carolina?

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Miles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Dr. Curtis Miles

Piedmont Technical College
Greenwood, South Carolina

October 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This project was sponsored by a grant from the South Carolina Partnership for Distance Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE0811180

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
High-Risk Adults: who, what, and why?	2
Who are the high-risk adults?	2
Why are they high-risk?	4
Why invest in this population?	5
Who Provides What Services, and How?	6
Key workforce development agencies	6
Training services vs case management services	7
Recent changes in workforce development	8
Work first versus learn first	9
Training opportunities within the work-first strategy	10
Employer participation	11
How Might South Carolina Proceed?	11
What lessons have we learned?	12
What works with this population?	14
Technology, training, and the high-risk adult	18
Models of "Work and Learn Together"	22
Recommendations	22

Appendices:
A - Promising Practices: national models
B - Promising Practices: commercial materials
C - Document References
D - People Sources

Executive Summary

This report examines high-risk adults in South Carolina who need training in order to obtain a job which pays a living wage: who they are, what they need, what's available, what's needed, and what works (and doesn't). Two investigative methods were used. First were interviews with several hundred workforce developers across the state. Second was investigation of national studies and experts. Both groups said many of the same things.

Three types of people need assistance: the chronically unemployed, the recently laid-off worker, and the working poor. Cumulatively, they represent over thirty percent of the potential workforce in the state: an important resource for employers urgently seeking higher-skilled employees.

The three groups have somewhat different, but overlapping, needs and prospects. As a rule, unemployed adults need a strengthened work ethic, basic skills, and specific jobs skills; they have a tough time qualifying for higher-skilled jobs. The laid-off workers often have a sound work ethic, but also often have weak basic skills and may need job skills training if they seek to change careers. They have the best chance of moving into higher-skilled jobs, but often must settle for a smaller income than in their previous job. The working poor often have basic skills weaknesses and limited jobs skills; some also have a weak work ethic. Almost all of them have one or more weaknesses which limit their access to self-sufficient careers.

Four different types of agencies serve these populations, in varying ways and degrees: social service agencies, education agencies, private/non-profit agencies, and for-profit companies. Until recently, there has been very little significant *structural* coordination among them, although informal local cooperation among a few of them has frequently occurred. The new Workforce Investment Act (WIA), which took effect this July, mandates collaboration at all levels among a number of those agencies.

The major funding streams for workforce development are welfare reform (WR) and the new WIA initiative. Both programs follow a *work first strategy,* which seeks to place people in reasonable (but often low-level) jobs and assumes that they will later use employer or other funds to get further education/training in order to move up. Selective skills training will be available only to those otherwise unable to find an initial job. WIA replaces the JTPA program, which followed a *learn first strategy*: get extensive training first, and then seek a living-wage job. A second major difference is that WIA and WR place much more emphasis than did JTPA on case managers, who work with individual clients in a variety of ways.

In-state workforce developers' experiences with welfare reform tend to parallel what other states and national studies have reported. Large numbers of adults have left the welfare rolls, but far fewer have left poverty; most remain in poverty-level jobs or have moved from job to job. Few of these adults have, in fact, returned for additional training, even when employers offer tuition reimbursement and similar incentives. Lack of reliable child care and transportation remain chronic barriers for many.

State and national experiences also identify a number of things that work effectively with these populations. These features common to successful programs fall into five general categories

- o Program collaboration (among providers, early employer involvement, on-going communication).
- o Program design (customized to employer needs, early agreements, clear goals, minimum hassle, avoidance of labeling, and continual staff development).
- o Program services (both work and learning, hands-on experience, personal attention, strong support services, job coaches/developers, and credentialing).
- o Training delivery (job-specific skills, blend content with relationship-building, integrated skills, intense training, active learning, high expectations, motivation, and work experience).
- o Program accountability (tracking and documentation, accountability of clients, staff, employers, and funders).

Special attention during the research was paid to the possible roles of technology in providing training for this population. A number of computer-based programs have been used successfully, but only with parallel emphasis on one-on-one contact, up-front assistance, and relationship building. In many parts of the state, weak access to computers and resources to buy them are considerable problems. Distance learning technology has not yet been employed with this population, except for a few internet-based GED training programs emerging in other states. Practitioners and experts worry that successful learning at a distance requires a type of initiative, confidence, and prerequisite skills that few high-risk adults possess. Access is also very limited in the state.

South Carolina has a large number of skilled, experienced, and committed workforce developers who are working hard to assure that these adults move into productive careers that pay a living wage. The need is to assure that "the systems" allow them to do that. Overall, the features of successful programs, national and state experience, and a number of national promising practices suggest strongly that neither the work first strategy nor the learning first strategy is broadly successful alone. Successful programs seem to find ways to combine the two strategies into a "work and learn together" strategy. We need to assure that WR, WIA, and other resource programs in the state allow us to create that combination.

The major recommendation is to create a working task force of front-line workforce development professionals who would over a period of 8-12 months explore in greater depth what works and doesn't nationally and in-state and prepare a detailed plan for a "work and learn together" system for South Carolina. With over 30% of our adult workforce at stake, the state cannot afford missteps, cannot afford to reinvent the wheel, and cannot afford to fail. A small investment now would save millions of dollars later.

For further information, contact: Dr. Curtis Miles
Piedmont Technical College
P.O. Drawer 1467
Greenwood, SC
864-941-8511
miles_c@piedmont.tec.sc.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Employers want larger numbers of skilled employees. High-risk adults want access to skilled jobs that pay a living wage. The challenge for South Carolina is to figure out how to bring the two needs together.

This research project examined a variety of questions:

o Who are these high-risk adults, what do they need, and why should society help them?
o Who currently provides them with help, and how do (and don't) they do it?
o What works, and what doesn't, in providing that help?
o What are the issues South Carolina should consider, and what are the recommendations?

The project focused on South Carolina, but necessarily also included national trends and findings, since many other states have offered some of our current or emerging services - and studied their impact - much longer than our state has done.

The project explored these issues in several, mostly qualitative, ways: several dozen focus groups across the state; discussion of specific and general issues with many key South Carolina governmental agencies; communication via e-mail and phone with national experts; and review of many national studies.

The initial intent was to focus on 'education and training' for these high-risk adults. It soon became apparent that it was impossible and inappropriate to separate training from job placement and retention activities. In this discovery South Carolina wisdom matches national research: training and placement/retention must be wedded if we are to serve this population effectively.

A particular emphasis within the "what works and doesn't" segment was to examine the actual and potential role of distance learning as a means of effectively and efficiently delivering some of the necessary instruction. This emphasis is important because, in several areas of education and training, distance learning solves some transportation problems while offering promise of solving a key organizational difficulty: how to provide individual learners with what they need without requiring "class-sized groups" in a single location at the same time.

This is a practitioner's study rather than a research study. That is, the focus is not on 'establishing truth' but rather on providing policy makers and the people on the front lines with information and ideas they need to consider when trying to construct systems which effectively help high-risk adults.

Limited hard data is available for South Carolina specifically; much of the research arises from national studies. Whenever data relates specifically to the state, this is mentioned. Otherwise, the data is national.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

High-Risk Adults: who, what, and why?

Who are the high-risk adults?

This project studies the high-risk adults in South Carolina who need skills training in order to obtain productive careers paying a living wage. They fall into three general groups: the unemployed, the working poor, and the recently laid-off.

The best statistical data on these populations comes from 1999 JTPA data (for the working poor and recently laid-off) and DSS data (for the unemployed adults).

	Unemployed Adults	Working Poor	Recently Laid-Off
Female	91%	70%	69%
Male	9%	30%	31%
Age: Up to 29/30	57%	53%	21%
30/31 to 42/44	33%	45%	46%
42/45 to 54	9%	2%	25%
Black	69%	69%	55%
White	30%	30%	44%
Lacks high school diploma		21%	20%
High school diploma		60%	57%
Some college education		19%	23%
Reads under 9th grade level		41%	32%
Math under 9th grade level		63%	60%

[Note: age categories look confusing because JTPA and DSS use different age ranges]

Such data suggests both similarities and differences between these three populations. Generally, South Carolina data seems to match national reports.

Unemployed adults comprise perhaps 6-7% of the state's potential adult workforce as of August, 2000. This number is larger than the current state unemployment rate of 4.2% because the latter rate only includes those adults who have worked within the last year and are seeking work. However, a significant number of adults are "discouraged workers" in the Employment Security Commission's terms: not seeking work. A considerably larger 12% figure for these unemployed adults was suggested frequently by workforce developers across the state; this seems to be high, based on how ESC calculates its figure. A 6-7% figure seems most realistic.

The best portrait of South Carolina's chronically unemployed adults can be drawn from the ranks of those aged 18 and up who are on welfare. As the above table shows, almost all are female and most are black. The largest adult age group is 18-30, followed by 31-36. If they are typical of national demographic studies[26], most lack a high school diploma, function at a low literacy level, have weak or no marketable job skills, and have multiple problems. A number speak English only as a second language. Note, however, that these are *typical* cases. The state's welfare reform efforts to date match national studies: many welfare clients perform well above these levels. However, most of the "easy-to-serve" adults have already moved off the welfare rolls.

The working poor represent about one-quarter of the nation's adults. The U.S. Department of Labor[26] defines the working poor as "individuals who spent at least 27 weeks per year in the labor force (working or looking for work), but whose income fell below the official poverty threshold"; they estimate this group as 21% of the adult population. A major research study estimates that 28.6% of American workers "were paid hourly wages that, even if they were employed full time all year (and many are not), would not earn enough to raise themselves and their families above poverty."

Who are the working poor in South Carolina? The SC Employment Security Commission does not track this population yet. However, it is likely that most of the adults going through the JTPA program in 1999 (who were not on welfare) were among the working poor. Thus this data was used in the preceding table. Many of them are part-time workers. The 1999 SC Employment Practices Survey indicates that 23% of jobs in the state are part-time, and that 9% of the jobs pay only minimum wage. Many of these adults also have English-language difficulties. National studies indicate that over half of the working poor (58%) work full-time. They tend to work in service and retail jobs: one study estimated that almost 32% of the working poor worked in such jobs. They tend to have multiple jobs. They are twice as likely to have less than a high school education. Some 26% of single women with children are working poor (as opposed to 2% of two-parent households) [26]. A recent study of young adults in South Carolina suggests that a large proportion of younger workers tend to be among the working poor. A Department of Labor report[26] pointed out that "although nearly three-fourths of the working poor were white workers, black and Hispanic workers continued to experience poverty rates that were more than twice the rates of whites."

[26] = Numbered footnotes in this report refer to the numbered documents in Appendix A.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recently laid-off adults represent a special subset of these populations: those recently out of work because of business cutbacks and closings. As the previous table indicates, they tend to be considerably older than the working poor or the unemployed adults. A higher proportion is white. They probably have a higher education level than the unemployed. Based on national studies, most of them will have marketable job skills (although those seeking to change careers will often lack the necessary new skills). Most will have a strong work ethic. And they will mostly have overcome the major barriers to employment, such as reliable child care and transportation. Many are not "high-risk" in the sense of this study; they have simply had the bad luck to work for employers who fell on hard times.

Why are they high-risk?

Most of the high-risk adults are in that situation because they have multiple unmet needs. Those needs tend to fall into four categories.

Basic Skills Weaknesses. The National Adult Literacy Study estimates that 25% of South Carolina adults function at the lowest literacy level. Another 31% function at the second-lowest (of five) level (www.casas.org/lit/litcode). The Conference Board[2], while citing such data, also concludes that some 80% of those with very weak literacy do not see this as limiting their job opportunities! Workforce developers across the state frequently mentioned weak basic skills as trapping many working poor. Many lack the basic skills to perform higher-skilled jobs. While over three quarters of welfare clients are at the two lowest literacy levels, almost two-thirds of employed adults are in the top three levels[11]. The 1998 S.C. Statistical Abstract estimates that 31% of South Carolina adults lack a high school diploma or GED, a major problem since growing numbers of employers require high school completion as a minimum credential for employment. Many of those with diplomas still have weak basic skills.

Work Ethic Weaknesses. Workforce developers and employers across the state believe that a weak work ethic is the greatest single problem for the unemployed and a problem for many of the working poor. As a typical example, one Chamber of Commerce executive director estimated that 16 of every 20 new employees hired in his area during the past six months were terminated within six weeks, almost all because of poor attendance, inability to get along, and the like.

Job Skill/Readiness Weaknesses. National estimates[12] suggest that upwards of one-third of the unemployed have not held any job for more than six months, and that only ten percent of welfare clients are skilled enough to move beyond entry-level work. Both nationally[24] and in South Carolina the pattern is to place high-risk adults into entry-level and relatively poorly paid jobs from which they have not yet escaped. For many, a Catch-22 is that their basic skills are so weak that they cannot get into or complete job skills programs. For example, several technical colleges offer "manufacturing certification" programs whose graduates are offered interviews or jobs with major area employers; typically, more than half of those applying fail the prerequisite basic skills tests. The impact can be dramatic: a study by the US Department of Commerce[25] estimates that specific skills training increases an average employee's weekly pay by 29%.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other Limitations. High-risk adults tend to have other limiting factors. Lack of reliable transportation appears to be the most common problem, followed by lack of reliable child care. A growing proportion of the state's adult population are trapped into (usually low-paying) occupations where sound English-speaking skills are not required. Many have documented disabilities.

Why invest in this population?

Adults with the problems described in the previous section are difficult - and usually expensive - to help. Helping large numbers of them to qualify for good jobs which pay a living wage would represent a major commitment of state funds, far in excess of what is channeled from federal sources. Given the competing demands for state funding, a legitimate question is: why invest in this population? Possible answers fall into two categories: social benefits, and economic benefits.

Social Benefits

We are already "investing" heavily in this population, in forms as varied as welfare rolls, incarceration rates, numbers of children arriving in kindergarten or the first grade "unready to learn", and poor health. Study after study documents the impact of weak adult literacy, poverty, joblessness, and the like on all of these factors. Each takes its steady toll on South Carolina resources: tax bases, insurance rates, weak educational performance, uncompensated health costs, poor child and adult health, and so forth. For example, the S.C. Department of Corrections calculates that it costs an average of $15,336 *per year* to maintain one person in a South Carolina prison. Most of these prisoners have weak basic skills and job skills. An investment of only one year's worth of such prison costs in training and job placement at some earlier point in their lives would have equipped many of these (mostly young) people to go to work rather than to prison.

Economic Benefits

Many studies estimate that, while in the 1950's some 60% of jobs were unskilled and only 20% were skilled, by the mid 1990's these figures had reversed. Most jobs now require skilled employees. The National Alliance of Business[14] estimates that unskilled workers now comprise only 12.7% of the workforce, and that percentage is dropping. Our education and training systems have lagged far behind this change in terms of developing a skilled workforce. The National Alliance for Business also estimates that 70% of businesses view workforce lack of skills as a major barrier to growth. One in five businesses has reportedly postponed expansion because of this problem. The state Chamber of Commerce's recent study[20], *Skills That Work*, found that the state's employers value basic skills and work ethic as greatly as they do technical job skills.

A recent national study of employer involvement in welfare reform initiatives cites three economic benefits to employers: "more effective access to an expanded labor pool, reduced employee turnover, and increased motivation and loyalty among new hires."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Conference Board study[2] documents the impact of helping this population in terms of increases in productivity, and points out that higher employee skills "produce a variety of indirect economic benefits, such as improved quality of work, better team performance, improved capacity to cope with change in the workplace and improved capacity to use new technology." Since an estimated 70% of new jobs will be high-skilled[3], the investment in developing the skills of upwards of one-third of our potential adult workforce becomes even more of a wise economic investment.

Who Provides What Services, and How?

Key Workforce Development Agencies

The groups and organizations which provide direct workforce development services to the unemployed and working poor can be grouped into five categories: social services, education, private/non-profit, for-profit, and employers. This list does not include those groups (such as the State Chamber of Commerce) which work at the policy or research level rather than providing direct services.

Social service agencies consist of those governmental agencies which have direct responsibility for promoting the well-being of high-risk (and other) adults. Each has state-level leadership staffs and local or regional offices, with varying degrees of autonomy. They include the following:

Department of Social Services (DSS) - traditionally responsible for management of the state's welfare system, with a heavy emphasis on service through social workers having direct contact with individual clients.

Employment Security Commission (ESC) - traditionally responsible for such direct employment-related services as matching applicants with available jobs (Job Service), management of unemployment insurance, and similar services.

Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) - provides services to individuals with a variety of disabilities. Their goal is to assist their clients to enter or maintain gainful employment.

Other social service agencies (such as the housing authority) sometimes play active workforce development roles in particular communities, usually because of the energy of particular staff members.

Education agencies, consisting of:

Adult Education - responsible primarily for three services to adults: GED preparation, high school completion, and literacy development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Technical College System – provides credit and non-credit programs for adults seeking technical, job readiness, and prerequisite skills, and for providing other students with the first two years of a four-year college education.

Private/non-profit agencies of many types, often locally-based.

Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) - the regional organizations responsible for coordinating and/or facilitating economic development activities and funding in their regions. Though not a direct service provider, the SDA's role and influence on workforce development services is so strong that they need to be considered a 'provider' for purposes of this report.

Community Action Agencies - the regional agencies responsible for providing case management and facilitation services for adults and youth to help them obtain gainful employment.

Literacy Councils - in many counties, such councils (funded through a combination of adult education and private funds) provide tutoring and small-group instruction to help adults improve their literacy skills; some also provide basic consumer and other skills.

United Way - some United Ways, such as Midlands, operate active workforce development programs.

Goodwill Industries - operate active workforce development programs in selected communities.

Other non-profits - many locally-based organizations provide assistance to high-risk adults, often including elements of workforce development.

For-profit companies in various parts of the state provide workforce development services. These range from content-specific programs (e.g. computer training, truck driving) to consulting firms who operate governmentally-funded training contracts for high-risk adults.

Training services versus case management services

These workforce agencies have traditionally provided two different types of services for high-risk adults: training services, and case management services. The differences between the two are important in deciphering the changes in workforce dynamics that will be occurring in the state over the next few years.

Training services focus on finding cost-effective ways of helping high-risk adults develop specific work-related skills. Adult education, the technical colleges, and most for-profit companies focus on these services. Usually the training occurs in "class-sized groups" or in computer labs where a number of students are present. Adult education reports that over 8,500 adults received a GED or high school diploma in 1999. In that same year almost 89,000 students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enrolled in credit programs at the technical colleges, and some 9,625 of them graduated.

Case management services focus on helping specific individuals with particular difficulties which affect their work or potential work: anything from substance abuse problems to lack of interviewing skills, from lack of transportation to health problems. Case managers usually work one-on-one or in very small groups. The social service agencies, the community action agencies, and most other non-profits focus mainly on these services. Some operate statewide, and many only in individual communities. Although no consolidated figures are available, many thousands of adults are provided with such case management services.

A few agencies and programs perform both functions, but mainly the training providers and case managers have very different priorities, values, and ways of operating. Traditionally there has been little formal collaboration among most of these agencies, and no consistent philosophy, tracking systems, integration of services, and the like. Informally, effective local collaborations often exist among some of them, based mainly on personal contacts and informal referrals, and occur mostly among case management agencies.

Recent changes in workforce development

Two major changes have recently occurred in the state's workforce development initiatives: Welfare reform(WR), and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

Welfare Reform (WR). The S.C. Family Independence Act of 1995, combined with parallel federal legislation, dramatically changed the state's welfare philosophy and services. Under this legislation, DSS changed from its traditional role as a 'welfare maintenance' agency to a "job placement and retention agency". Its mandate became that of doing what was needed to move every 'employable' welfare client into a job, and off of welfare. In 1999 some 8,690 South Carolina welfare clients (predominantly women) left the welfare rolls. Over 10,000 obtained part- or full-time jobs.

Those clients either went straight to work or received a few weeks of broad-spectrum training (basic skills, work readiness, and work ethic). To a considerable degree DSS' social workers have become employment case managers, concerned with helping clients find jobs and stick with them. The impetus is a statutory time limit of two years of subsidized support services (e.g. transportation and child care); clients must become self-sufficient in their jobs within that time frame, so that they can absorb those support costs themselves after two years.

Workforce Investment Act (WIA). For the past several decades, the major workforce development service for high-risk adults has been JTPA (and its predecessor programs). This initiative provided training funds for thousands of such adults each year (over 8,000 completed some form of skills enhancement in 1999). Some of the training was in short-term specialty areas (such as certified nursing assistant and truck driving). Most of it was done through enrollment in 1-2 year technical programs at the state's technical colleges. Although focused mainly on training, JTPA had an extensive counselor/case manager function to help the students

find and stay in jobs.

As of July 1, 2000 the JTPA program was replaced by the WIA initiative, whose focus is on using one-stop career centers to provide adults with the key information and coordinated support services they need to obtain meaningful jobs. Adults may progress through as many as three levels of service in order to obtain a reasonable job. The first level, core services, is open to anyone, and is designed to provide basic information, tips, resources, vacancy notices, and the like. Those unable to obtain a reasonable job may thereafter be enrolled in the second level, intensive services. These services, delivered mostly via case managers, will provide more intensive job readiness assistance. Those failing to find a reasonable job after these services, or being assessed as needing more intense help, may move to the final level: training. At this level they will be helped to find an on-the-job training slot (and related employment) with an area employer or may be provided with a voucher to use for more intensive, job-related skills training. Much case management at the latter two levels will be devoted to helping the client acquire and stick with a job.

An important aspect of the WIA initiative is that it mandates an active partnership among those agencies providing a dozen different types of workforce development services. The agencies will include the SDA, the community action agency, the technical college, the office of adult education, vocational rehabilitation, and the Employment Security Commission (ESC), which has been designated in South Carolina to be the lead delivery agent. Other agencies may also be involved, depending on who is responsible for the twelve mandated services in particular regions. Many of the one-stop centers are located in ESC offices, which will tend to bring about as much change in those offices as the local DSS offices encountered when adjusting to their welfare reform responsibilities.

Work First Versus Learn First

Welfare reform and WIA represent a profound shift in workforce development strategy. The phased-out JTPA program was based on a learn-first strategy, which held that high-risk adults should first receive substantial skills development and *then* seek a job, with help from trained counselors. This strategy dovetailed with the philosophy and priorities of the training service providers, such as adult education and the technical colleges.

Welfare reform, on the other hand, represents a work-first strategy, which holds that high-risk adults should receive only brief training (if any) prior to getting a job. The underlying assumption is that, once solidly in place in a job, the person will seek out further training (hopefully with employer support) in order to get the skills needed to move up to a better (and higher-paying) job. The newly-initiated WIA program is based on this same work-first strategy. Both dovetail with the philosophy and priorities of the case management providers, such as social service agencies and community action agencies. Additionally, the WIA initiative in most parts of the state provides less funding than did the earlier JTPA program, further reducing the emphasis on training as opposed to job placement and retention.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The shift in strategy has several implications. The training service agencies need to re-think and redefine their role in serving high-risk adults, since the work-first strategy places minimum rather than maximum emphasis on training. The case management agencies need to modify their styles and expertise to deal much more intensely with employers and career realities than was necessary in their former roles. Both groups need to watch carefully the impact of the work-first strategy, and to be prepared to work together if it goes awry. Observations from the welfare reform program in South Carolina match the experiences of those nationally[24] who have worked both with that program and with earlier one-stop initiatives: clients are *not* returning for the skills training that would lead to promotions to higher-skilled jobs. Thus far, local judgments and national studies conclude that most of them have remained in low-paying jobs which hold limited promise of self-sufficiency.

Training Opportunities within the Work-First Strategy

Most of the training opportunities immediately available in the new work-first system are limited in scope and focus. This has occurred for several reasons. WIA funds are more scarce in most regions than during previous years. A major funding source, DSS, has not traditionally focused on 'the training business". A number of regions and organizations seem to interpret 'work first' as 'work *only'*. And the organizations with legislative responsibility for workforce development training, the technical colleges, have not historically provided intensive short-term training for this population.

Various regions in the state offer a relatively small number of broad-band training programs for welfare clients, usually a 3-5 week program consisting of some basic skills development, job readiness skills, work ethic development, and the like. Programs common across the state provide specific skills training in areas such as nursing assistant, truck driving, construction, and phlebotomy. Significant ESL training is only gradually emerging, mainly in the construction trades. A few technical colleges have provided longer-term training focused on specific job skills: heavy equipment operators, welding, and manufacturing. Unfortunately, many of the more common programs put the least-prepared graduates into some of the toughest jobs in the state (such as nursing assistants, who with little training must deal effectively with the very demanding problems of the aged).

Because of cut-backs in WIA funding (compared to the earlier JTPA funding) and the emphasis on rapid job placement, in most parts of the state the predominant training option for the hardest-to-serve will be placing them in on-the-job-training rather than in formal skills training programs. Nationally, this strategy has tended to place these high-risk adults in low-level jobs from which they do not escape; a recent study reported that less than 25% of welfare clients who were placed in jobs had successfully made the transition to higher-quality jobs after ten years[25]. DSS, however, is seeking to redirect unused welfare funds into projects which *do* provide for longer-term training.

Additionally, federal/state regulations hamper placement of high-risk adults in extended training programs. A prime example is the requirement that welfare reform clients be rapidly placed in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

situations where they must work at least 30 hours per week (20 hours for parents with very young children). This requirement arises from the limited time period in which such clients can receive support services (such as transportation and child care) as they make the transition to permanent employment. However, a major side effect of this requirement is that it drastically undercuts their option of enrolling in skills training programs.

There appears to be very limited room for intensive basic skills development (reading, writing, and math). Under both WR and WIA, basic skills training may be provided only to the degree that it is needed to qualify for a specific entry-level job. The major rationale for this requirement is that those most needing basic skills development also need immediate jobs and income as they are moved off of welfare support. The argument is that the client cannot afford to go hungry while taking the (often extensive) time needed to improve their basic skills. However, moving these adults into minimal entry-level jobs without simultaneously increasing their basic skills usually does not equip the person to move into higher skilled, higher paying jobs.

Employer Participation

Employers play a variety of roles in adult workforce development. A limited number of employers (often large, and often manufacturing) play very proactive (action-initiating) roles, ranging from creating positions and providing mentors through provision of funding and actual delivery of training services. Many employers serve on regional workforce boards. However, South Carolina's workforce developers judge that for the most part the role played by employers has been reactive (waiting to be asked for something) rather than initiating action. This has been particularly noticeable in the initial conceptualization, design, and development stages of workforce programs; few employers have reportedly been involved at those stages, and usually in an 'approval' rather than creative role.

Although many welfare clients have been placed in jobs, opinions of in-state workforce developers suggest that most employers are still hesitant to hire high-risk adults. This is understandable, given the increasing focus on quality assurance and high productivity among American employers.

D. How Might South Carolina Proceed?

Decades of "learn first and then work" strategy has given way to a "work first and then seek learning" strategy. By and large, training solutions have taken a back seat to case management solutions. There is a growing emphasis on helping high-risk adults to get into the workplace quickly. Partly this represents a shift in public policy. To a considerable degree, it represents a powerful demand by employers for a larger number of higher-skilled employees.

The WIA initiative is new to South Carolina: only four months old and immersed in clarifying its strategies, policies, and methods. To assure maximum effectiveness, we need to examine what

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

can be learned from our longer-standing welfare reform and other, more-localized, efforts to help high-risk adults into the employment mainstream, and from the national experiences and research of those who have tried to make this happen longer than we have.

The overall conclusions? Many unemployed adults *have been* helped to become employed adults, but this has not often enough moved them out of poverty. And the working poor *have* acquired additional skills which move them into jobs which pay a permanent, living wage, but not in the numbers we would hope. South Carolina's experience matches national research. To place high-risk adults in substantive jobs, we need to practice neither simply work first nor simply learn first, but both cleverly blended: "work and learn together".

What lessons have we learned about helping the high-risk?

The insights shared by South Carolinians deeply experienced in trying to help high-risk adults attain livable employment are substantially the same as the insights reported nationally. What "we have learned" seems to fall into four categories, as follow.

The traditional system has had significant problems.

Outside observers tend to remark on the sheer number of agencies and groups seeking to help this population. Usually, they conclude that this represents substantial duplication. Yet as a national study points out[6], there are more gaps than duplication. The agencies differ markedly in many ways: which adults they can and cannot serve, how they serve them, and what services they provide (help with personal issues versus quick-fix training versus long-term education versus specific job placement).

A major weakness has been a lack of consistent philosophy, strategy, and priority among these agencies: each tends to go its own way. WIA's emphasis on partnerships is an important response to this historic problem.

Nationally, a second lack has been weak tracking and referral systems: needy clients have tended to get lost between agencies, or to lose heart and quit[7]. This does not seem to be as much of a problem in South Carolina, based on the opinions of local workforce developers. Some pointed out that the intensive tracking systems required by federal programs minimizes this while demanding large amounts of staff time and attention.

Many case management agencies have lacked the expertise or priority to assure that their clients have strong enough skills to succeed in the workplace at a level which provides self-sufficiency. The requirements of their funding sources, their agency missions, and their concern that their clients quickly find sources of income have tended to lead them toward quick-fix training, if any. Furthermore, their backgrounds as one-to-one helpers rather than educators have not inclined them to think of training/education as a vital first step.

Many education agencies, on the other hand, have provided only weak help to these adults in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

finding and retaining jobs, or in dealing with the other problems which hinder their employability. Both adult education and the technical colleges have tended to "think training" rather than "think one-to-one help".

Furthermore, too often the education agencies' "ways of doing business" have hindered their success. For example, state adult education funding provides a small dollar amount for each adult involved in training for 12 hours per year. No additional funding is provided if the adult gets more training than that, although a major national study[4] suggests that it requires 200-900 hours of basic skills training to move a high-risk adult to self-sufficiency. There is no fiscal incentive for adult education leaders to promote in-depth learning beyond twelve hours per year. Similarly, the former JTPA program placed thousands of students in educational programs at the technical colleges which required two or more years to complete: an unrealistic goal for many high-risk adults. Funding for the technical colleges now provides little incentive for them to address the particular short-term training needs of high-risk adults.

Many leave welfare, but don't leave poverty.

A recent study estimated that in 1997 about 1.5 million people left the welfare rolls[4]. It pointed out that in a study of seven states (not including South Carolina) from 61% to 87% of "job-ready" welfare clients had found jobs. However, the national study underscored what many other studies had indicated: most of those leaving the welfare rolls for jobs found only low-wage positions. Many of them were still eligible for food stamps and Medicaid. Discussions with South Carolina workforce specialists indicated that this is also true here, although firm figures are not available: DSS only maintains data in terms of who makes minimum wage or above, not what they make. However, DSS data indicates that some 78% of the welfare clients finding work in 1999 took sales, clerical, or service jobs - traditionally low-paying. National data and state experience also point out that relatively few high-risk adults move into jobs that provide benefits, especially health benefits.

This trend may soon accelerate. Current legislation allows welfare clients leaving the rolls to use government-funded support services for two years. As noted earlier, lack of adequate transportation and child care are critical problems with many high-risk adults. The welfare reform legislation has allowed provision of these services to date. However, as increasing numbers of these clients use up their two-year "safety net", they will suddenly be faced with massive expenses for these services. Many practitioners in-state (and nationally) speculate that, if they have not moved up to a higher wage during that two years, they will be unable to absorb these costs and will have to drop back out of the workforce.

High-risk adults don't return to learn.

An underlying tenet of the work-first strategy is that these adults, once reasonably secure in their jobs, will seek training in order to get the skills needed to move up. Unfortunately, both South Carolina's experience and the nation's reach identical conclusions: they don't go back for training.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Partly, this is because newly-placed high-risk adults have too much on their new plates (job, family, transportation, child care, life changes, etc.) to have time and energy for further training. Many have failed in school in the past, and do not want to go back. Many are unwilling to acknowledge basic skills weaknesses to their employers. Many lack the funds to pay the training costs up-front and then get repaid months later. . Also, as noted previously, most of those with lower literacy skills do not see this as a problem, and thus do not seek training as a solution to their low-skilled status. By and large, new high-risk employees need more than money; they need encouragement, enablers, and incentives (such as promotions).

National studies[26] underscore that most in-company training goes to the mid-skilled and high-skilled, not to the low-skilled. A recent study[6], for example, documented that only about 30% of employers provide welfare reform or basic skills training to new employees, whereas about 80% provide training in leadership, team building, and the like. A related issue is that a large proportion of the high-risk population entering the workplace cannot access the types of support services (e.g. transportation and child care) that they need in order to make training on their own time a practical option

The impact is severe. Major studies[24] indicate that, unless high-risk adults are somehow placed in a living-wage position at the outset, they tend never to escape from their condition. Another study[4] pointed out that, although only 12% of high-risk adults *did* return for further training, those who did so made major advances in their income: by an average of 16% in three years, and 39% after five years. Clearly, and not surprisingly, better skills lead to better jobs. Of course, those seeking such training tended to exhibit initiative and motivation which might well have led to their promotion in any case.

Retention is a problem.

DSS' data suggests that two-thirds of those welfare clients placed in jobs were still in them after 30 days, which is the longest time they tracked their retention. Their data also reported that only 21% of the clients placed in jobs in 1999 had returned to the welfare rolls by the end of that year (nationally, 29% returned during 1995-1997). However, South Carolina's practitioners expressed considerable skepticism that most of these high-risk adults had remained in their initial job. Many suggested that those clients with weak basic, job, or work ethic skills simply recycled from job to job. Many seemed to be on their fifth or sixth job within a year or so. National studies emphasize the same finding. DSS has taken the initiative in establishing a multi-agency task force to explore how best to focus social service efforts on placement and retention of this population.

What works with this population?

Several national groups have studied programs which were successful in placing high-risk adults into stable jobs which paid a living wage. They have itemized a number of design, infrastructure,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and service features common to those programs. Discussions with practitioners around South Carolina added an important ingredient: the instructional practices which were effective (and not effective) in providing the actual training services for this population. These lessons can be grouped into five general categories: collaboration, design, services, delivery, and accountability.

Program Collaboration

a. Collaboration among service providers. Successful programs mixed services provided by several agencies. Regular, active communications and collaboration among these partners was a hallmark of success in these programs.

b. Early employer involvement. In successful programs, employers became proactive partners at a very early stage, and in a variety of ways. They helped design the program, provided resources to support it, demanded accountability and helped focus on practical outcomes. Programs where employers played only access roles tended not to be as successful.

c. On-going staff-employer communications. Programs where project staff talked frequently with involved employers tended to be more successful. Such conversations ranged from redesign questions and accountability assessment to joint discussions of and work with particular clients placed at the employer's site.

Program Design

d. Programs need to be customized to employers' needs. Training service and case management staffs have certain perceptions about the workplace and what particular employers actually need (or can tolerate) in terms of employee skills and attitudes. Successful programs have taken steps to assure that these perceptions are adjusted to the actual needs and conditions of specific local employers.

e. Agree on strategies in advance. Work-first requires that partners act in new ways and share resources and responsibilities in new ways. Successful programs have faced the reality and difficulty of making such changes, have talked through the alternatives and consequences, and have agreed in considerable detail on the specific strategies (processes, roles, resources) which they collectively will use.

f. Establish clear goals and outcomes. Successful programs develop and agree on very clear, work-related goals and outcomes, both for their program as a whole and for each individual client.

g. Minimize employer and client administrivia (paperwork and exacting procedures). Training and case management providers, particularly those operating with government funds, tend to operate within an environment of steadily-increasing paperwork and regulation. This can be particularly true when several different agencies are collaborating in the same program. Successful programs have gone to great lengths to insure that, whatever administrivia is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

necessary, it is as invisible as possible for two key partners: employers and clients.

h. Don't label populations. Successful programs tend to have bridged a challenging divide. On the one hand, high-risk adults often need special support services (esp. transportation and child care) while they are making the transition to independence. On the other hand, other employees often resent such provision and label the recipients as "weaker workers" (a label which tends to stick). Intense staff and employer strategizing and effort are needed to provide special support services without creating resentment.

i. Emphasize continual professional development. In a work-first, collaborative program, most staff must change attitudes and roles, and must often become familiar with their partners' operations and policies. Case managers must learn training, and trainers must learn case management. Such new programs have a steep learning curve as they seek to balance the many services they must provide and the many new groups they must work with. Successful programs acknowledge these difficulties by providing continuous (not one-shot) and very targeted (not general) training opportunities for their staffs.

Program Services

j. Provide both work and learning. Successful programs, no matter what the requirements of their funding sources, have found ways to provide their clients both with meaningful jobs and with meaningful learning. The clearest, most consistent finding of many recent national studies is that one does not work without the other, in terms of helping high-risk adults obtain permanent jobs that pay a living wage. One national study represents many: "approaches that combine education and job skill training with work to make work a learning experience hold the most promise for providing low-skilled workers with the tools they need to progress beyond entry-level, low-wage positions."

k. Provide hands-on work experience to teach valuable skills. Successful programs use clients' jobs or assignments to OJT or other work experiences as a vehicle for much crucial training in work skills, basic skills, and work ethic development. In successful programs such learning does not take place accidentally; it is a deliberate, planned, and central part of what the client does and who works with the client on the job. It also helps when employers provide training on-site, split costs, and allow training at least partly "on the clock".

l. Give early, personal attention to client problems. High-risk adults bring many difficulties and needs with them: substance abuse, poor self-concepts, disabling attitudes, lack of skills, family problems, lack of key life skills, and the like. Few programs are equipped to tackle all of these issues for each client. Successful programs have, however, become adept at noticing when one or another difficulty is hampering client performance, and have adopted "rapid response" systems for directly and personally addressing the issues with that particular client.

m. Provide strong support services during the transition. As has been noted, unreliable transportation and child care is a major cause of unemployment or poorly-paid employment. Successful programs find ways to provide such services at first, combined with a clear plan for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

how the client will continue them thereafter.

n. Provide both job developers' and job coaches'. Even in time of low employment, jobs (whether permanent, OJT, or work experience) are not always easily available. Many employers are skeptical about high-risk adults' ability and willingness to be productive and dependable. Successful programs have staff who are skilled at developing such opportunities, both generally and for specific clients. They also have staff who can serve as coach, intermediary, trainer, and enforcement officer for clients once they are on the job: a vital role which often lasts for a year or more.

o. Provide a credential as a result of training. In programs which do this, students tend to experience a stronger sense of achievement and closure, and employers are given a stronger signal as to the basic competence of the graduate (if the program has a good track record).

Training Delivery

p. Focus training on job-specific skills. Successful programs maintain focus and motivation by concentrating on the specific job skills, basic skills, and work ethic needed by a particular type of job. Ideally, the focus is on a particular job at a particular company which is waiting for the client once training is completed.

q. Blend content/skills with relationship-building. Successful programs recognize that most of their clients have weak self-esteem, multiple problems, and poor educational experiences. Successful programs have found ways to cover particular content while also enabling the students to establish significant relationships with each other and with the staff. Just "covering the material" is not the hallmark of successful programs.

r. Integrate job, basic, and work ethic training. Successful programs have a carefully planned instructional sequence and dynamics which blend all three elements into a dynamic, active set of learning activities.

s. Train intensely when possible. Those programs working with the unemployed tend to be most successful when they meet every day for a half- or full-day, for several weeks. This both allows some of the other principles of training delivery to better occur, and it accustoms the client to "being there" in much the same way that they will be expected to "be at work": all day, every day.

t. Emphasize active, multi-dimensional learning. High-risk adults tend to have been unsuccessful in traditional academic settings, with their emphasis on lecturing and other forms of passive learning. Successful programs emphasize activity, flexibility, responsiveness to the moment, and multiple ways of teaching/learning.

u. Maintain high expectations. Some high-risk adults are not used to being on time, having positive attitudes, controlling themselves when interacting with others, doing high-quality work, and the like. Successful programs establish and maintain high expectations in such areas, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

quickly confront lapses and turn them into learning experiences (both for the individual and for the class).

v. *Establish and maintain strong motivation to persist.* As earlier sections emphasized, few high-risk adults are returning for training once employed, for many solid reasons. Successful programs have found ways to provide such motivation, often with heavy involvement from the employers, by conducting the training on employer sites, and the like.

w. *Emphasize work experience IF the client is prepared.* As mentioned above, OJT and other forms of work experience are important parts of a complete program. However, successful programs have learned to assign students to such situations only when they are adequately prepared, with an acceptable work ethic being one of the key enablers.

Program Accountability

x. *Strong tracking and documentation system.* Successful programs have strong record-keeping systems, both for effective evaluation and to meet the diverse reporting and accountability needs of the various partners. Strong programs thoughtfully develop such systems up-front, rather than allowing them simply to evolve as new circumstances arise.

y. *Hold clients accountable.* Many high-risk adults, and particularly the unemployed, are used to others taking responsibility for their actions. Successful programs both enforce high expectations during preparatory activities and continue those expectations once the client is employed (often, a priority task for the job coach).

z. *Balance accountability to funders, employers, staff, and clients.* Each group will have its own expectations and needs. Successful programs figure out how to balance these sometimes-conflicting expectations and create a system that meets the *minimum* expectations of them all. The accountability mechanisms are then designed to document and report the relevant outcomes for all parties.

Technology, training, and the high-risk adult

Technology is opening up significant new options for instructional delivery in the United States. A question of interest in this study was therefore to explore the inroads that technology had made, or might make, in training high-risk adults. The technology explored falls into two general categories: computer-delivered instruction, and distance learning.

Computer-Delivered Instruction

Computer software has been effectively used for basic skills education in high schools and colleges for years. Both nationally and in South Carolina much of this same software is proving effective with high-risk adults seeking training rather than education. Some of the software is being applied "as is"; some of the more effective software has been revised to more strongly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

emphasis work-based applications of the basic skills. Other computer software has been created from the beginning to simulate actual work environments, as the context for learning basic skills and job readiness skills. Although computer software is used extensively in the technical colleges to teach technical jobs skills, this application does not seem to be used with high-risk adults to any considerable degree.

A number of South Carolina providers, both public and private, report using such software effectively. Appendix B lists "promising practices": commercial instructional materials which have

been mentioned as successful by practitioners in the state. Several are computer-assisted instructional packages.

Most providers of computer-delivered training report that it is used for three purposes: basic skills development, basic computer operations skills, and word-processing and other job-related computer skills. Local practitioners tend to agree with national studies that many or most high-risk adults can become comfortable with using computer-assisted instruction IF they get heavy initial up-front assistance. Many come to like this approach to learning.

Both local practitioners and national studies very strongly emphasize that computer-assisted instruction is not effective with this population if it is initially separated from considerable human contact, for several reasons. First, most clients need much help and reinforcement before they become comfortable "going it alone". Second, a key ingredient in effective training practices for this population is to combine skills development with relationship-building, which requires considerable contact with others. Third, the technology is by no means foolproof, and high-risk adults tend to become easily frustrated with technical glitches. Someone needs to be there to fix such glitches.

A number of practitioners echoed national concerns with resources. The quantity of computer facilities available for use with high-risk adults is extremely limited. Although some non-profit and government agencies have acquired computer labs (even portable labs), most have not, citing the cost both of hardware and of software. The largest quantity of instructional computing labs reside in the technical colleges, but almost all of these are booked (or overbooked) to serve the colleges' academic or continuing education clients. Use of high school facilities in the afternoons and evenings has often been cited as a possibility, but with a few exceptions this does not appear to be occurring. Some of the reasons cited are lack of funds to pay for instructors or aides, problems with putting additional major software on the schools' computer networks, and concerns about guaranteeing that the computers will be in working order the following morning. A small number of employers provide manned, computerized learning laboratories on-site; their results are mixed, often depending on whether or not the employees have an incentive for using them.

Distance Learning

What is distance learning? The United States Distance Learning Association defines it as "the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

delivery of education or training through electronically mediated instruction including: satellite, video, audio-graphic, computer, or multimedia technology. Distance education refers to teaching and learning situations in which the instructor and the learner or learners are geographically separated and therefore rely on electronic devices and print materials for instructional delivery."

A significant focus of this study was to explore the feasibility of using emerging distance learning technology to deliver skills training to high-risk adults. The interest arose from two potential benefits: easing the transportation problems of those interested in training, by bringing the learning closer to their homes; and/or making training more cost-feasible by having one instructor serve a number of clients simultaneously, even though in different locations.

The distance learning (DL) business is booming in academic circles and in the higher levels of employee training. Nationally, the use of DL with high-risk adults is emerging, but not booming. In South Carolina, this use of DL to help high-risk adults seems as yet to be scarcely above a whisper.

The National Institute for Literacy[16] divides distance learning into four delivery modes: video technology, internet technology, audio technology, and telephone technology.

Video technology includes video conferencing, cable, satellite linkages, videotapes, and audio/video. Nationally this is the mode most prevalent in the emerging efforts to serve high-risk adults. Several major initiatives have produced satellite broadcasts and/or videotape programs which have been successful nationwide and are being used in South Carolina. Several of them are cited in Appendix B.

The programs delivered via satellite, though electronically generated, in fact usually require an instructor or instructional aid in a classroom with the students. It is distance-generated more than distance-delivered, in the sense of the students being in different locations from each other. A major benefit of such programs, however, is that they promote several of the principles of effective training delivery cited above; use of work situations, alternative media, active learning, and the like. South Carolina Educational Television is active in this arena.

Videotape-based programs can be used in much the same way as satellite programs, with much the same benefits. Another way to use them is the "videotape checkout" model, in which students check out videotapes and related materials, use them wherever equipment is available, and then return them. This use is more consistent with the broader implications of distance learning, but presents problems. Many students lack the self discipline, time management skills, and other attributes needed to actually follow through on these lessons. This is true even with college students, and is likely to be an even greater problem with high-risk adults, although this is the model being implemented with this population in California[16] (with many support systems, telephone contacts, and the like).

Audio/video broadcasts can range from compressed video programs (delivered over telephone lines, with significant time delays and somewhat awkward feedback mechanisms) through full-motion audio/video/data programs (delivered over fiber optic cable). A number of colleges and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

high schools in the state are exploring such systems (and a few of the technical colleges have extremely advanced systems). Thus far, however, there is little evidence (in state or nationally) that such systems are being significantly used to provide training services to high-risk adults. Their use focuses on academic courses (especially college and high school advanced-placement).

The problems with their use (even in academic settings) include the very different levels of technology available across the state. Broadcasting from one site to others automatically drops the broadcast to the "lowest technological denominator", which in most cases is quite low.

Internet Technology focuses on delivery of instruction over the internet to students who are able to connect with the instruction through any internet-equipped computer. This mode of delivery has seen explosive growth at the college level during the last several years, and is increasingly being used for mid/upper-level employee training. It has proven very effective for those students with the necessary motivation, self-initiative, access to equipment, and related skills and attributes.

Use of internet delivery for high-risk adults is clearly emerging in one area: GED preparation. There are a number of "GED-prep" programs available nationally, several from commercial producers but a growing number developed by literacy providers. Most of them build in extensive internet chat rooms, phone calls from an instructor, and similar support services for the individual students. Many report growing numbers of students enrolled, and growing numbers who complete and successfully pass the GED.

It is not yet clear, however, how many unemployed and working poor adults possess the traits needed to complete such programs. As national literacy expert John Sabatini* stated when addressing this issue, "there is not reason to believe that high-risk adults will be effective, self-regulated learners. Most of them have not had successful learning experiences to build on, so they lack study skills, time management skills, self-monitoring and self-evaluation. Consequently, they are most in need of the support of teachers, coaches, peers, scaffolding, modeling, and guidance."

A particular problem seems to be that of how to provide such adults with the initial training and support in computer and internet operations so that they can henceforth "learn on their own". To the degree that they are effective, however, such courses might do much to overcome the clients' transportation and child care problems. Some agencies offer "virtual high schools" which allow students to complete their required high school courses over the internet; this use does not seem to apply strongly to the needs of most high-risk adults.

Several of the developers of the computer software programs mentioned previously are actively developing internet-based versions of these programs. This holds promise of providing more options for high-risk adults during the next few years.

Some national programs (and one initiative in South Carolina) included a rather limited use of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the internet. Students used internet courses to master GED-prep materials or basic skills, but they did so in a self-contained laboratory setting. The materials are, in essence, being used to substitute for computer-assisted instruction. Given the breadth of the internet and its inherent interest (to some students), this might in fact represent an improvement over most CAI materials, though it does not reduce the problems of travel, transportation, and the like.

Audio technology includes radio and audiotapes. Only a few states expected to use this delivery mode extensively. None of those interviewed in this study indicated that they used, or planned to use, this technology with their clientele in South Carolina.

***E-mail correspondence with the author.**

Telephone technology includes teleconferencing. As with audio technology, few states anticipate using this mode widely, and none of the in-state practitioners indicated that is was a priority for them.

Although nationally many are cautiously enthusiastic about the potential of distance learning to help train high-risk adults, most South Carolina practitioners across the state expressed skepticism. They judged that most of those they dealt with lacked the self-confidence, the initiative, and the technological skills to respond effectively to many of the more advanced forms of distance learning, particularly internet-based instruction.

Overall, several national studies and a number of practitioners exchanging messages on the internet reached much the same conclusion: distance learning sounds like a very exciting possibility for better serving high-risk adults, but we need to proceed with caution.

Models of "Work and Learn Together"

A number of communities and states have developed creative and effective ways to implement versions of the "work and learn together" strategy. Wichita, Kansas' 21st Street Training Program, for example, surmounts the problems of luring adults back for training after job placement by hiring welfare clients as employees from day one, then putting them through a 6-month combined skills training and OJT program, in-plant. The Hospitality On-Site Training (HOST) program uses the same strategy with several hotels in Ohio. Portland's Pathways program combines enrollment in job-focused academic education programs with job development and placement, heavy case management, and support services, tying employers heavily into the process.

Kentucky has tackled the problems from a different direction, by passing legislation which allows welfare clients to use education and education-related activities to meet their mandated work requirement for two years or more. Massachusetts provides 10-week to 5-month intensive training programs customized to job vacancies in specific companies (which agree in advance to hire the graduates). They also provide support services and some post-training support.

These programs, and many others, suggest that promoting both work and learning in the new

work-first system can be done, with sufficient commitment and creativity. Appendix A lists a number of those programs, cross-referenced to descriptions in the national studies which selected them as models.

Recommendations

Following are recommendations for South Carolina policy makers and workforce practitioners. They are based on the preceding analysis, and on the assumption that it is in the state's best interests to do what is possible to transform high-risk adults into skilled employees.

The recommendations are not in priority order, with the exception of the first one, which in practice would implement all of the others.

1. South Carolina should establish a working task force to inspect programs (statewide and nationally) that effectively provide "work and learn together" services for high-risk adults to help them develop into the type of skilled employees which the states' employers need. This task force should consist of a small number of people who: (a) are broadly experienced in front-line workforce realities; (b) can think imaginatively and impartially about workforce system possibilities; (c) represent the major workforce development players in the state; and (d) are enabled by their agencies to commit substantial time for 8-12 months. Their mission would be to cull the best of what the state and nation have to offer in terms of preparing high-risk adults for skilled jobs and to develop a detailed proposal for establishing an optimal system in South Carolina. [Rationale: South Carolina cannot afford to ignore our long-term workforce development problems and opportunities, cannot afford to fail in confronting them, and cannot afford to reinvent the wheel. A small investment now will save millions of dollars later.]

2. Workforce development leaders at both the state and local levels should conduct in-depth investigations to discover how much latitude can actually be created to effectively combine both work and learn services under the WR, WIA, and other funding streams. [Rationale: other states, such as Kentucky and Massachusetts, have found ways to adjust requirements; we need to learn from them, and apply what we learn].

3. Public training providers should carefully investigate how to retool their current training services to make them more effective and accessible under the work-first strategy. [Rationale: "business as usual" methods arising under the learn-first strategy don't always work well under the new strategy, yet training will remain a key ingredient in moving high-risk adults into skilled jobs].

4. Case management providers, training providers, and employers should aggressively and creatively collaborate to find effective ways to channel newly-working high-risk adults back into skills-upgrading training (both basic skills and technical skills). [Rationale: nationally this seems to be the largest and most important unresolved issue; we need to

tackle it now, rather than waiting to discover that it is also a problem as South Carolina implements WIA and continues WR].

5. Employers at both the state and local levels should carefully explore what it will take to turn high-risk adults into skilled employees, and re-examine what their roles in that process actually need to be. [Rationale: employers are a key ingredient at all levels: placement, retention, and training. They are a major winner if the system works well and widely. Almost certainly, their ability and willingness to greatly expand their involvement will be a major factor in the system's success].

6. A state agency should create an ongoing, centralized capability to find, distill, and disseminate national research, thinking, and experiences with effective methods of helping high-risk adults become skilled workers. [Rationale: we need to learn as much as possible from others, for maximum efficiency and effectiveness].

7. A state-level organization should research and promote the application of computer-based and distance learning technologies to providing training and related services to high-risk adults. [Rationale: computer and distance learning technology offer significant potential for addressing the "economy in numbers" realities of skills development. But high-risk adults also present particular difficulties for technology-based education and training. Experts from both realms need to explore these opportunities and problems.]

Appendix A

Promising Practices - National Models

Appendix A

Model Programs Nationally

Many areas of the country have over the past several years developed innovative programs which effectively implement key elements of a "**work and learn together**" strategy; some of them appear to have all of the key elements.

Most of the following state, regional, and local programs have been recommended by a major national study (which is identified in the description). They were selected26 from the descriptions provided by those studies, not from personal investigation. Those selected seemed to fit South Carolina's socioeconomic and geographic dynamics (for example, they were not build around involvement of a single massive company, or selected small numbers of participants from large urban areas). When available, a contact source is identified.

The 21st Street Training Program in Wichita, Kansas helps welfare clients become full-time employees of a local Cessna Aircraft Company plant. Trainees are Cesna employees from the first day of combined in-plant skills training and OJT, which usually lasts for six months. The program provides intensive support services (including child care). Some 70% of entering clients still work at Cesna. (Source: Stillman, *Working to Learn*. Contact: Johnnie Cartledge, Plant Manager: 316-293-1000, Jlcartledge@cessna.textron.com).

Advanced Technology Program at Oakland Community College in Pontiac, Michigan trains welfare recipients in 15- to 20-week cycles that are custom designed to fit specific job titles for major information technology sector employers with chronic labor shortages (Source: Stillman, *Working to Learn*. Contact: Sharon Miller, Program Manager: 248-340-6787, semiller@occ.cc.mi.us).

Association of Rehabilitation Programs in Computer Technology, housed at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, is a 48-member national consortium focused on equipping adults with disabilities to prepare for information technology careers. In combination, the partners provide training and place students in IT positions. (Source: Stuart: *21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs).*

Brooklyn Child Care Provider Program in Brooklyn, NY is a five-month literacy-based vocational training program through which graduates qualify for positions as assistants in child care centers, or as self-employed family child care providers. Basic skills instruction occurs in a child care context, and students alternate weekly between classroom and work/internship sites. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works*. Contact: Cheryl Harwood, 718-722-3462).

Canton Even Start Program in Canton, Ohio offers a work-based program, with academic skills taught in context as needed to fulfill participants' roles as parents, workers, and citizens. Communication, interpersonal, decision-making, and life-long learning skills are emphasized. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works*. Contact: Jane Meyer, 330-588-2148).

CAP Services Family Literacy Program in Wautoma, Wisconsin combines in-depth assessment, parenting skills, GED preparation, tutoring, on-site work experience, life skills training, and employment skills training in a single "one-stop" location. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works.* Contact: Mary Patoka, 715-345-5208).

Cleveland's SES Project in Cleveland, Ohio provides a six to 12-week program including basic skills instruction integrated with work experience at a community agency (such as the local Ronald McDonald House). Skills are applied in a work setting, with the core curriculum based on the SCANS competencies. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works.* Contact: Judith Crocker, 216-631-2885).

Commons Employment and Training Center in Chicago focuses on ABE, GED, and ESL instruction, and combines this with employment training, self-assessment, parenting skills, and comprehensive support services provided on-site by many partner agencies. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works.* Contact: Jenny Wittner, 773-772-0900).

Economic Initiatives Program in Phoenix, Arizona provides public housing residents with skills training, academic remediation, support services, internships, and job placement. The goal is to enable participants to earn a salary that allows them to support themselves and their families. (Source: Stillman: *Working to Learn.* Contact: Molly Weiss, 602-261-8946, mweiss@ci.phoenix.az.us).

Education for Gainful Employment in New York uses contextual learning and mentoring to provide work-related basic education, GED preparation, ESL services, life skills, job readiness, job development and job placement and retention. It offers many programs to fit the many needs and goals of its diverse high-risk population. (Source: Hanken: *Strategies to Promote Education, Skill Development, and Career Advancement Opportunities.* Contact: Robert Purga or Barbara Shay, 518-474-8920).

Education Works in Lawrence, Mass. conducts GED and ESL instruction, pre-employment skills workshops, adult basic education, customized training, job placement, life skills development, and post-placement support. (Source: National Governors' Association: *Ten Principles for Effective Workforce Development Programs.* Contact: Susan Perrault, 508-681-4975).

Federation Employment and Guidance Services in New York City provides welfare recipients with three weeks of training and work experience at Macy's. Trainees spend half-days in work experience assignments, and the other half in training which includes soft skills, customer-service, basic retail operations, and Macy's-specific procedures. (Source: Stillman: *Working to Learn.* Contact: Virginia Cruickshank, 212-366-8532, vcruickshank@fegs.org).

Global 2000 - Continuing Education Institute in Watertown, Mass. is a partnership of ten companies to improve the basic literacy and technical skills of workers in manufacturing industries. It offers classes in English communications, reading comprehension, business writing, word processing, and math. (Source: Stuart: *21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs).*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hospitality On-Site Training Program in Columbus, Ohio provides a program of 1-2 weeks of classroom-based life skills training, followed by 34 weeks of four days on the job and one day in class. This program is offered to new employees as a way to improve both skills and retention. (Source: Stillman: *Working to Learn.* Contact: Howard Nusbaum, 614-224-4714, howard@ohla.org).

Kentucky Community & Technical College System provides a combination of basic skills development, technical education, and work experience to welfare clients for up to 24 months under special enabling state legislation. The program provides case incentives for obtaining the GED and higher education certifications, and supports the program with case managers assigned to the participating colleges. (Contact: Shauna King-Simms, 859-246-3146).

Learning Enterprises in Colorado Springs, Colorado offers education and training services, including assessment, experiential learning, direct training, and computerized instruction in areas ranging from technical manufacturing, and computer applications to customer service, human skills, and basic skills development. Training occurs at company sites or college facilities. (Source: National Governor's Association, *Ten Principles for Effective Workforce Development Programs.* Contact: Susan Perrault, 508-681-4975).

Massachusetts Community College Welfare-to-Work Project is a statewide effort to combine academic skills and employment services for welfare recipients with less than two years remaining on their benefits' time limit. Training is targeted to specific employers and jobs, which guarantee employment after training. Ten-week to five-month training is accompanied by direct work experience, and followed by ongoing counseling and support. (Source: Hanken: *Strategies to Promote Education, Skills Development, and Career Advancement Opportunities.* Contact: Robert Purga or Barbara Shay, 518-474-8920).

Metropolitan Community Colleges in Kansas City, Mo. compresses its 180-hour call center training program into six weeks, and matches its graduates with customer service positions available from over 20 area providers. (Source: Carnevale, Reich, Sylvester, and Johnson: *A Piece of the Puzzle*).

Minnesota Pathways Project links job skills and education to create identifiable career paths and advancement opportunities for welfare recipients. It serves as a third-party negotiator in establishing a diverse array of business-education partnerships which focus on helping the clients move into specific jobs with long-term futures. (Source: Hanken: *Strategies to Promote Education, Skills Development, and Career Advancement Opportunities.* Contact: Robert Purga or Barbara Shay, 518-474-8920).

Oakland Community College in Pontiac, Michigan has partnered with major corporations to design an intensive 20-week training program that guarantees its graduates full-time jobs with benefits in the high-tech industry. (Source: Carnevale, Reich, Sylvester, and Johnson: *A Piece of the Puzzle.*).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project Quest in San Antonio, TX works closely with the business community to identify recurring job openings that pay living wages and then designs training programs to fit these criteria. It also works to overcome the barriers that adults face in returning to school for long-term training (an average of 16 months) by paying tuition costs, child care, transportation, and offering motivational and life-skills training. (Source: Stuart: *21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs.*).

South Bay GAIN Employability Center in San Diego, CA integrates skills instruction and job experience for welfare clients, many of whom have no previous work experience. The program includes an emphasis on GED preparation, ESL training, SCANS competencies, job readiness classes, and a job developer, all located at a single site. (Source: Murphy & Johnson: *What Works.* Contact: Melinda Templeton, 619-662-4024).

Steps tó Success at Portland (OR) Community College Steps to Success provides training and job placement services to welfare recipients living in Multnomah and Washington Counties. Program services include job search assistance, voluntary work experience, paid work experience, adult basic education, GED preparation, ESL instruction, vocational training, mental health counseling, drug and alcohol assessment and referral, career and life planning, job retention services, and supportive services such as child care and transportation. The mission of the program is to empower individuals to enter the work force and be self-sufficient. (Contact: Nan Poppe, npoppe@pcc.edu).

Appendix B

Promising Practices - Commercial Instructional Materials

The instructional materials in this Appendix have been recommended by one or more workforce professionals contacted during this study. Each product is included because of this recommendation and because the publisher provided key information about the product, including field-level adopters to contact for their experiences with and opinions of the product. Other materials were also recommended, but the publishers did not provide this information; in such cases, the materials are not included. Commercial assessment materials have also been excluded. Inclusion in this report does not constitute endorsement or recommendation by the researcher.

Appendix B
Promising Practices – Commercial Materials

Program Name: Aztec Basic Skills Software

Contact Information: John Coplin, Aztec Software Associates,
6071 Bob Daniel Road, Oxford, NC 27565,
(888) 615-8301, FAX (919) 603-1878; coplin@gloryroad.net

Description: The Aztec Learning Systems include a series of job-related, self-paced software programs in areas such as language arts, mathematics, mechanical reasoning, and business communications. With testing, learning, practice, and accountability, the system blends the stimulation of a good classroom with learning-by-doing, creating a "feel good" environment. The program is correlated to TABE, ABLE, TASS, ACT's Work Keys, AFCT/ASVAB, CLEP, DSST, and GED exams.

Costs: The Aztec Learning Series is available in Site License, Individual Workstation, or Internet format. Prices include: management system, on-site training, technical support, and upgrades for one year. Prices range from $675 (one module) to $24,800 (50 workstations, all modules).

Adopters to Contact:
Dr. Therese Paquette, Office of Tribal Government, South Carolina (803) 366-4792, ext. 210
Nadine Burgess, Goodwill Industries of NW Carolina, (336) 923-2310

Program Name: Basic Life Skills at Work

Contact Information: Micro-Intel
1200 Papineau Avenue, Suite 301
Montreal, Quebec Canada H2K 4R5
(800) 530-8789; FAX (514) 528-1770; www.micro-intel.com

Description: Basic Life Skills at Work is an adventure and strategy game with a range of activities designed to improve the user's English-language, calculation, and computer skills. Users become detectives, employing their powers of observation and analysis to solve a mystery while at the same time working on grammar, reading comprehension, and basic arithmetic. The system is suitable for the more advanced levels of ABE and ESL (reading level 3-5), includes up to 140 hours of training on basic math and English, 72 activities (with self-adapting difficulty levels, 9 learning modules, easy instructions on how to use a computer, and was created by workplace training organizations specializing in adult basic education.

Costs: Single Unit - $99.95; LabPack 5 - $319.95; LabPack 10 - $549.95; LabPack 25 - $1,199.95

Adopters to Contact:
Sallie Garrett, Help Literacy Program, Virginia, (540) 676-4355
Vickie M. Cramer, Thomas Johnson High School, Maryland, (301) 694-1807
Leslie Gelders, Oklahoma Department of Libraries-Literacy Resource Office, (405) 521-2502

Program Name: CCC Destinations

Contact Information: Michael J. Bolds
(770) 716-9092; FAX (770) 716-9198
Michael_bolds@cccpp.com

Description: CCC Destinations 2.0 is an essential skills curriculum designed specifically for the way adults and adolescents learn. The curriculum offers over 12,000 core-learning activities in reading, math, writing, life and employability skills, citizenship, and job-related applied skills for levels 0-12. By continually making decisions, drawing on past experiences and linking prior knowledge, clients develop basis skills, life skills, critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills while building self-esteem.

Costs: Prices range from $680/workstation (for over 1,000 stations) to over $$2,550/workstation (for 1-10)

Adopters to Contact:
Sandra Hussey, Ridge View High School, South Carolina, (803) 699-2999, ext. 456
Jan Bates, Hillsborough Corrections Facility, Florida, (813) 247-8488

Program Name: Employability and Work Maturity Skills

Contact Information: The Computer Learning Works, Inc.
P O Box 866
Starkville MS 29760
(800) 445-3038; FAX (601) 324-1189
clw@netdoor.com

Description: Employability and Work Maturity Skills assists users in gaining knowledge and skills that will enhance their ability to choose, locate, obtain, and maintain employment. The management system will match the data collection and reporting demands of school, job placement, school-to-work transition, and workforce development programs. Computer administered pre-tests prescribe individualized training sequences that each student needs. The management system automatically compares pre- and post-test scores to monitor and document the achievement of program objectives. The system requires little or no computer experience or training, and includes 11 employability and work maturity skill sub tests.

Costs: Unit cost - $1,000, Multi-station license - $6,000

Adopters to Contact:
Larry Oswald, South Carolina Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, (803) 896-6591
Eugenia Beach, South Carolina Department of Social Services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Name: ES-TIP

Contact Information: Carol Dierdorff
The Quality Group, Inc.
6059 Boylston Drive, Suite 250
Atlanta, GA 30328
(404) 843-9525; FAX (404) 252-4475; cdierdorff@thequalitygroup.net

Description: The Employability Skills-Training and Implementation Program (ES-TIP) teaches the knowledge and skills necessary for job search, and promotes the attitudes and strategies essential for job retention and career advancement. This software-based learning tool was originally developed by the Florida Department of Education to reach individuals with a variety of learning styles, skill levels, and backgrounds, especially harder to serve youth and adults. The system features a set of eight instructional sections, (10-12 hours). They use state of the art interactive CD-Rom; live action video technology, and interactive, real-life exercises.

Costs: From $2,250 to $14,250, depending on the number of sites and other factors. Multiple site discounts are available.

Adopters to Contact:
Gary Dunnigan, Support to Employment Project, Georgia, (404) 577-7312; FAX (404) 577-8625
Helen Pitts, Jewish Family Career Services, Georgia, (770) 9455; FAX (770) 677-9475

Program Name: KeyTrain Software for Work Keys

Contact Information: Thinking Media
Sheila Boyington, (423) 842-6205), www.keytrain.com

Description: KeyTrain is a computet-based instructional system to enhance basic skills associated with the ACT Work Keys system. KeyTrain reviews topics in each Work Keys Skill areas and provides practice problems similar to those on an actual Work Keys assessment. The skills include: Applied Mathematics, Reading for Information, Locating Information (workplace graphics), Applied Technology, Writing, Listening, Teamwork, and Observation. There are over 400 hours of instruction in these courses. KeyTrain has minimal hardware requirements and can be networked with student tracking features. KeyTrain includes an online occupation information database.

Costs: 1-year site license for colleges/work force development - $4,500
3-year site license for colleges/work force development - $9,000
There are other options and discounts available.

Adopters to Contact:
Ed Schultz, SC State Board of Technical and Comprehensive Education, South Carolina, (803) 896-5343
Kim Gardner; PeeDee Regional Council of Governments, South Carolina, (843) 669-4271
Kathy Blanchard, South Carolina ACAP Consortium, South Carolina, (803) 481-8512

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Name: LearningPlus

Contact Information: Learning Plus
33 S. Delaware Avenue, Suite 202
Yardley, PA 19067
Carolyn O'Brien, COBrien@mktgworks.com

Description: LearningPlus is a fully interactive, self-paced computer-delivered instructional program with accompanying handbooks for students who want to improve their reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking skills. The system includes: preassessment; individualized learning plans, data collection and reporting and over 35 hours of full-color instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics (including problem-solving and critical thinking skills).

Costs: Single site license (includes 100 student registrations) = $3,250
One-year unlimited site licenses = $8,500
Two-year unlimited site licenses = $16,000
Training (without expenses) = $750.00
Training (including expenses) = $1,500

Adopters to Contact:
Sgt. Marva Thomas, Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, (853) 963-4578
Dr. David Reilly, Dean, The Citadel, South Carolina, (843) 953-7118
Ms. Shannon McCord, Hewlett-Packard, Oregon, (541) 715-8493

Program Name: PLATO

Contact Information: TRO Learning
4660 West 77th Street
Edina, MN 55435
(612) 832-1000; FAX (612) 832-1200
www.plato.com

Description: PLATO is a computer-based instructional system designed to enhance the learning process and help adult learners reach their fullest potential. PLATO provides interactive, individualized instruction in a broad range of subjects, such as reading, writing, math, science, and social studies, as well as work skills, life skills, and basic technical skills. Specialized solutions can be created for community colleges, vocational schools, universities, and other postsecondary institutions. The PLATO Learning System aligns to the South Carolina Curriculum Standards, PACT preparation, ACT Work Keys, SAT, GED, and other national assessments.

Costs: Prices vary widely. A state agency recently received a 50% discount on their package at $1,677 per license.

Adopters to Contact:
Joan Mason, S.C. Workplace Resource Center, South Carolina, (864) 984-1928
Maureen Spawr, Westvaco, South Carolina, maspawr@westvaco.com

Reproduction Release

Program Name: SkillsBank4

Contact Information: The Learning Company, Hart, Inc.
320 New Stock Road
Asheville NC 28804
(800) 654-8012; FAX (828) 645-9294

Description: SkillsBank4 is a comprehensive basic skills software program in language, reading, writing, basic mathematics, intermediate mathematics, and information skills. The program will test/place/manage each person's (student or adult) progress. SkillsBank4 brought additional sight, sound, interactivity, and new content to levels that reach all students/adults whether they are an auditory or visual learner.

Costs: SkillsBank4 Deluxe Set

Stand Alone -	$1,695.00
5-user lab pack -	$3,190.00
50-user net/site -	$6,190.00
Unlimited net/site -	$9,170.00

Adopters to Contact:
Susan Suber, Newberry County Career Center, South Carolina, (803) 321-2674
Marge Thomy, Central Carolina Technical College, South Carolina, (803) 778-1961
Sister Elizabeth Ogilvie, Horry-Georgetown Technical College, South Carolina, (843) 347-3186

Program Name: skillsCOMPASS

Contact Information: Learn Scape Corporation
326 First Street, Suite 38
Annapolis MD 21403
(888) 588-5200; FAX (410) 626-9774
info@learnscape.com

Description: skillsCOMPASS is a computer-based, multimedia reading, writing, math and work skills program consisting of 163 modules that provide workplace skills for over 200 occupations, such as computer operators, truck drivers, home health aide technicians and sales clerks. It includes courseware designed specifically for adults currently in or seeking to enter the workplace. The current version contains an audio capability and more than 16,000 job related graphics. A Spanish audio version will be released soon.

Costs: Prices start at $350 per student, per year. Volume discounts are available.

Adopters to Contact:
Paul Sheally, Louis Rich/Kraft Foods, South Carolina, (803) 321-1832
Laura Weidner, Anne Arundel Community College, Maryland, (410) 541-2662
Steve Kornblatt, American Community Partnerships, Washington, DC, (202) 639-8811

Program Name: TV411

Contact Information: Nancy Rademacher, (212) 807-4244.

Description: TV411 is a video series that uses popular television formats and parenting, finance and health topics to teach pre-GED reading, writing, and math in real-life contexts. There are 20 half-hour episodes, each with an accompanying magazine style workbook, plus a web site under construction. A teacher's guide and a learner's guide are also available.

Costs: Through a partnership, TV411 is available at no cost to adult education and community-based organizations funded by the South Carolina Department of Adult Education, (Colleen Clark at SCDAE, (803) 929-2573). **Not for Profit purchasers** have a variety of options, from $40 to $1,200. **For profit purchasers** may choose options from $50 to $1,500. To discuss terms, call Alex Quinn (212) 807-4242

Adopters to Contact:

John Topping, Laurens Community Adult Education, South Carolina, (864) 984-5726
Henry Sparrow, Union County Adult Education, South Carolina, (864) 429-1770
Theresa Brewton, Spartanburg AWARE (Adults Writing and Reading Education), South Carolina, (864) 583-8141

Program Name: WIN Work Keys Instruction Solution

Contact Information: Worldwide Interactive Network
1000 Brentwood Way
Kingston TN 37763
(423) 717-3333; FAX (423) 717-WIN1; WWINetwork@aol.com

Description: The WIN Work Keys Instruction Solution is a computer software system which focuses on all 36 levels of the ACT Work Keys skills and aligns with the Work Keys system. The curriculum meets SCANS objectives and is useful with all workforce development initiatives including school-to-work, welfare-to-work, adult education, vocational education and intervention programs. Current users of the program range from secondary schools and community colleges, to government agencies, as well as private business and industry.

Costs: Computer-based pricing ranges from $1,500 per workstation up to $4,000 per workstation, depending on volume of workstations and number of skills. Print-based pricing is $12.95 per workbook or $9.95 per workbook, depending on volume.

Adopters to Contact:

Christine Riddle, York Technical College, South Carolina, (803) 981-7246
Melisa Browder, University of Tennessee, Tennessee, (865) 934-8163

Program Name: Workskills: Steps to Your Success

Contact Information: AchieveGlobal, (800) 456-9390

Description: This program develops fundamental interpersonal skills widely recognized as necessary in most entry-level jobs and beyond: line and staff support employees, new hires, and established employees. The results are: reduced turnover, increased productivity, ability to change, and loyalty. Seven, two-hour, flexible modules, available as a comprehensive system or individually, help participants learn to take responsibility for understanding and meeting basic workplace expectations.

Costs: For pricing information, contact Andrena Powell-Baker at (864) 427-3975 or APBaker@achieveglobal.com

Adopters to Contact:

Trisha Craven, Piedmont Technical College, (864) 941-8410
Karen Shobe, Tri-County Technical College, (864) 646-8361, ext. 2230
Lynn Creech, Pitt Community College, (252) 321-4216

Appendix C

Document References

Appendix C
Document References

The following documents were rich sources of information and ideas for this study. Those with an asterisk were particularly valuable. The reference numbers in the body of the report refer to the numbers of the references below.

1. Bernhardt, A., (1999). The Future of Low-Wage Service Jobs and the Workers That Hold Them (IEE Brief Number 25). New York, NY: Institute on Education and the Economy.

2. *Bloom, M., & Lafleur, B. (1999). Turning Skills into Profit: Economic Benefits of Workplace Education Programs (Research Report 1247-99-RR). New York, NY: The Conference Board

3. *Carnevale, A., & Desrochers, D. (1999). Getting Down to Business: Matching Welfare Recipients' Skills to Jobs That Train. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

4. *Carnevale, A., Reich, K., Sylvester, K., & Johnson, N. (2000). A Piece of the Puzzle: How States Can Use Education to make Work Pay for Welfare Recipients. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

5. * Freedman, S. (June, 2000). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies, Evaluating Alternative Welfare-to-Work Approaches: Two-Year Impacts for Eleven Programs. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U. S. Department of Education [On-line] Available: http://www.mdrc.org/Reports2000/NEWWS-11Prog/NEWWS-11ProgExSum.htm

6. Galvin, T. (Ed.). (October, 2000). Industry Report 2000. Training, 61.

7. *Grubb, W. N. (March, 1999). From Isolation to Integration: Occupational Education and the Emerging Systems of Workforce Development. National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Number 3, 1-10.

8. Hanken, K. H., (July, 1998). Strategies to Promote Education, Skill Development, and Career Advancement Opportunities for Low-Skilled Workers. National Governors' Conference [On-line]. Available: http://www.nga.org/Pubs/IssueBriefs/1998/980728Career.asp

9. Holmes, B.A., Hazel, K., & Wilson, A. (2000). Young Adults in South Carolina: A Comprehensive Report on the Lives of South Carolinians Ages 18-29. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Kids Count Project.

10. Jossi, F. (1997, April). From Welfare to Work. Training, 45-50.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11. Levenson, A. R., Reardon, E., & Schmidt, S.R. (1999). Welfare, Jobs and Basic Skills: The Employment Prospects of Welfare Recipients in the Most Populous U.S. Counties (NCSALL Reports #10B). Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.

12. Mills, J., & Kazis, R.. (1999) Business Participation in Welfare-to-Work: Lessons from the United States. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

13. Murphy, G., & Johnson, A.. (1998) What Works: Integrating Basic Skills Training Into Welfare-to-Work. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy,

14. National Alliance of Business. (1997). Enhancing Education and Training Through Technology. Washington, DC: Workforce Economics Trends, 1-8.

15. National Alliance of Business. (March, 1997) . From Welfare Rolls to Payrolls: What It Will Take. Washington, DC: Work America, Vol. 14, Issue 3.

16. *National Governors' Association, (July, 1997). Ten Principles for Effective Workforce Development Programs. National Governors' Association [On-line]. Available: http://www.nga.org/Pubs/IssueBriefs/1997/970728TenPrinciplesWorkDev.asp.

17. *National Institute for Literacy. (2000) How States are Implementing Distance Education for Adult Learners. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy.

18. National Institute for Literacy. (2000). From the Margins to the Mainstream: An Action Agenda for Literacy. Washington, DC: Author.

19. Rosen, D.J. (2000). Using Electronic Technology in Adult Literacy Education. In J. Comings, B. Garner, C. Smith (Eds.), Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy (pp 311-312). San Francisco, CA: The National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.

20. Rosen, D. J. (moderator), (January, 1999). Voices from the Field: Using Technology in Adult Literacy Education. National Literacy Advocacy [On-Line]. Available: http://www2.wgbh.org/mbcweis/ltc/alri/21c.html.

21. S.C. Chamber of Commerce. (1998). Skills that Work 1998: A Comprehensive Analysis of the Workforce, Education, and Skills Columbia, SC: Author.

22. S.C. Employment Security Commission. (1999). 1999 South Carolina Employer Practices and Benefits Survey. Columbia, S.C.: Author.

23. S.C. Employment Security Commission. (1999). South Carolina Labor Market Review, 1999 Columbia, SC: Author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

24. Stillman, J. (1999). Working to Learn: Skills Development Under Work First New York, NY: Public/PrivateVentures.

25.*Strawn, J., & Martinson, K. (2000) Steady Work and Better Jobs: How to Help Low-Income Parents Sustain Employment and Advance in the Workplace. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration and Research Corporation.

26.*U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Labor, National Institute for Literacy, & Small Business Administration. (1999). 21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs (ISBN 0-16-049964-X). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

27.*U.S. Department of Labor. (1997). A Profile of the Working Poor (Report 936). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

For those seeking further studies on this subject, the following two websites provide excellent references to a large number of relevant studies.

- o http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dwd/wrr/wrr-e.htm. This site, compiled by Wisconsin's Department of Workforce Development, provides references, descriptions, and hot links to over a hundred reports and articles,

- o http://www.jff.org/programs/cluster2/ewdi-prods-res.html. This site, produced by Jobs for the Future, provides references (and some hot links) to many articles, organizations, and other web and published workforce development resources.

Appendix D

People Sources

PEOPLE SOURCES

These pages list most of the individuals who were contacted, either individually or through focus groups, during this project. None of the opinions in the report should be attributed to any individual listed below.

First Name	Last Name	Organization	COG region
John	Abney	DSS-Beaufort	Low Country
Martha	Addis	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Jannie	Allen	Employment Security Commission-Beaufort	Low Country
Yoland	Atkinson-	York Technical College	Catawba
Norena	Badway	University of California-Berkley	
Harris	Bailey	Upper Savannah Council of Governments	Upper Savannah
Carolyn-	Banner	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Robert	Barber	JTPA	Catawba
Cecil	Barnes	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Eugenia	Beach	DSS-Columbia	Midlands
Gus	Becker	Central Carolina Technical College	Santee-Lynches
Gina	Bennett	College of the Rockies - Canada	
John	Benson	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Jackie	Berlinsky	Trident Technical College	Trident
Gary	Bishop	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Keith	Blanton	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Sharon	Bodrick	York Technical College	Catawba
Leigh	Bolick	DSS-Columbia	Midlands
Floyd	Bowles	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Douglas	Brackett	Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg
Fredrica	Brailsford	Community Services	Santee-Lynches
Doris Ann	Breeden	Employment Security Commission	Pee Dee
Horace	Brownlee	GLEAMNS	Upper Savannah
Ann	Carter	DSS-Walterboro	Low Country
Wayne	Casasanta	South Carolina Commission for the Blind	Spartanburg
Faye	Casley	Housing Authority	Pee Dee
Chris	Caver	Greenwood Vocational Rehabilitation	Upper Savannah
Colleen	Clark	State Office of Adult Education	State
Milton	Clark	Florence-Darlington Technical College	Pee Dee
Kelli	Collins	York Technical College	Catawba
Denise	Colter	Low Country Council of Governments	Low Country
John	Coming	Harvard University	
Gwen	Cooth	Low Country Council of Governments	Low Country
Cheryl	Cox	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Warren	Crowns	USC-Salkahatchie	Low Country
Shirley	Davis	Beyond the Door	Midlands
Ron	Davis	GLEAMNS	Upper Savannah
Evelyn	DeLaine-Hart	Trident SDA	Trident
Betty	Dietrich	Employment Security Commission-Walterboro	Low Country
Helen	Dills-Pittman	Low Country Council of Governements	Low Country
Edie	Dobbins	York Technical College	Catawba

First Name	Last Name	Organization	COG region
Betty	Dorn	Greenwood County DSS	Upper Savannah
Amy	Dowell	WIA-Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Edward	Duffy	York Technical College	Catawba
Dwayne	Earn	Employment Security Commission	State
Cathy	Eckman	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Everett	Feight	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Amy	Fendley	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Lula	Finley	Employment Security Commission	Catawba
Hubert	Fisher	Greenwood District 50	Upper Savannah
Keith	Floyd	Vocational Rehabilitation	Pee Dee
Donna	Foster	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Stan	Frick	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Constance	Gardner	South Carolina Vocational Rehabilition	Low Country
Teri	Garner	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Pat	Gibson	Trident Technical College	Trident
Teri	Gilstrap	Workforce Investment Board	Pendleton
Donnie	Glymph	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Allen	Grayson	DSS-Hampton	Low Country
John Carl	Haas	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Greg	Habib	Trident Technical College	Trident
Rod	Hamm	Texas A & M University	
Sharon	Harriott	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Linda	Harris	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Gaynelle	Harrison	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Glen	Hellenga	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Robert	Hogan	Florence-Darlington Technical College	Pee Dee
Henny	Holder	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Minnie	Holman	Employment Security Commission	Lower Savannah
Lynn	Horne	South Carolina Department of Social Services	State
Tony	Hough	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Jim	Hudgins	State Board for Technical/Comprehensive	State
Jim	Hull	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Bob	Isenhower	Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg
Ron	Jackson	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
John	Jamrogowicz	Trident Technical College	Trident
Sandra	Johnson	Upper Savannah Council of Governments	Upper Savannah
Arnold	Johnson	Waccamaw SDA	Waccamaw
Rose	Kearney-	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Morris	Keasler	Florence-Darlington Technical College	Pee Dee
Sonia	King	Orangeburg County DSS	Lower Savannah
Barrie	Kirk	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Nancy	Krewl	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Kal	Kunkel	Trident One-Stop	Trident
Marvin	Lare	DSS-Columbia	Midlands
Neil	Lark	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
David	LeGrande	York Technical College	Catawba
Cheryl	Lopanik	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country

First Name	Last Name	Organization	COG region
Jim	Love	DSS-Columbia	Midlands
Jean	Mahaffey	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Stephen	Marshall	Employment Security Commission	Catawba
Anne	Martinez	Texas A & M University	
Joan	Mason	Adult Education Workforce Resource Center	State
Sharon	May	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Anita	McBride	York Technical College	Catwaba
Sam	McClary	Employment Security Commission	State
Frances	McCollough	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Mary Ann	McDorn	JTPA	Catawba
Jan	McKelvey	WIA-Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Kathy	McKinzie	Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg
Anne	McNutt	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Audra	McPeak	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Tom	Mecca	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Butch	Merritt	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Raymond	Middleton	Low Country WIB	Low Country
Dr. Joyce	Miller	Piedmont Community Actions, Inc.	Spartanburg
Yvette	Mixon		Low Country
Angela	Mobley	Low Country Council of Governments	Low Country
Van	Modray	Trident Technical College	Trident
Barbara	Mooneyhan	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Pat	Moretti	Employment Security Commission-Bluffton	Low Country
Carolyn	Mosley	OCAB-CAA	Lower Savannah
Suzy	Murray	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Harris	Murray	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Charles	Muse	Florence-Darlington Technical College	Pee Dee
Al	Norris	SHARE-Anderson	Pendleton
Kathie	Olson	Midlands United Way	State
Claire	O'Neill	Trident Technical College	Trident
Phyllis	Overstreet	DSS-Allendale	Low Country
Gwen	Owens	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Jerry	Parker	Florence School District 3	Pee Dee
Max	Parrott		
Ann	Pearman	Tri-County Goodwill	Pendleton
Fred	Pearman	Tri-County Goodwill	Pendleton
Robert	Pedroza	Walterboro AE	Low Country
Dave	Pelham	Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg
Janice	Price	Wateree CAA	Santee-Lynches
Bill	Quinn	Employment Security Commission	Catawba
Mary	Rawls	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Mary	Reid	CCA, Inc.	Catawba
Andela	Reynolds	Employment Security Commission	State
Jean	Rickenbaker	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Karen	Roberson	Santee-Lynches Council of Governments	Santee-Lynches
Durrell	Rochester	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Queen	Roseboro	York Technical College	Catawba

First Name	Last Name	Organization	COG region
Carolyn	Rowland		Catawba
Linda	Rushing		Catawba
Mac	Rutland	Employment Security Commission-Columbia	Low Country
John	Sabatini	University of Pennsylvania	
Doug	Samples	Waccamaw SDA	Waccamaw
Carolyn	Sanders	Employment Security Commission	State
Robert	Schaerfl	Low Country WIB	Low Country
Joe	Schang	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Lynn	Schwartz	Upstate P.I.C.	Spartanburg
Fred	Seitz	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Sue Ellen	Shultz	Central Carolina Technical College	Santee-Lynches
Patricia	Slachta	Technical College of the Lowcountry	Low Country
Joyceu	Smith	Employment Security Commission	Pendleton
Hazel	Smith	Hampton Literacy	Low Country
David	Smith		Catawba
Kimberly	Staley	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Brenda	Steele	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Martha	Stephenson	Employment Security Commission	Catawba
Carolyn	Stewart	York Technical College	Catawba
Ron	Stockman	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
David	Stout	South Carolina Adult Education	State
Kathy	Stroud	Florence-Darlington Technical College	Pee Dee
Barbara	Stuckey	Sumter County Career Center	Santee-Lynches
Sharon	Teigue		Santee-Lynches
Marian	Thacher	San Diego Community College District	
Marjorie	Thomas	Employment Security Commission-Hampton	Low Country
Jan	Thomasson	Employment Security Commission	Catawba
Peter	Tintle	Spartanburg-DSS	Spartanburg
Grady	Tippit, Jr.	Pee Dee CAA-JTPA	Pee Dee
Ray	Trail	Spartanburg-DSS	Spartanburg
Kelly	Tribble	Midlands Technical College	Midlands
Vicky	Tyner	Pee Dee Council of Governments	Pee Dee
Barbara	Van Horn		
Dave	Walker	Low Country Tech Prep Consortium	Low Country
Paul	Walker	Employment Security Commission	Upper Savannah
Chris	Walsh	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Lex	Walters	Piedmont Technical College	Upper Savannah
Sandra	Wardlaw	DSS-Columbia	Midlands
Susan	Warner	Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg
Bertie	Washington	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Lower Savannah
Sandy	Watkins	Low Country Council of Governments	Low Country
Anita	White	Telamon Corporation	Pee Dee
James	Williams	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Starnell	Williams	Midlands Technical College	Pendleton
Jim	Wood	Tri-County Technical College	Pendleton
Bob	Wood	Central Carolina Technical College	Santee-Lynches
Frances	Yoder	York Technical College	Catawba